

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION**

2311 RACING LLC d/b/a 23XI RACING, and
FRONT ROW MOTORSPORTS, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR STOCK CAR
AUTO RACING, LLC, NASCAR HOLDINGS,
LLC, NASCAR EVENT MANAGEMENT, LLC,
and JAMES FRANCE,

Defendants.

No.: 3:24-cv-886-KDB-SCR

NASCAR EVENT MANAGEMENT, LLC,

Counter-Plaintiff,

v.

2311 RACING LLC d/b/a 23XI RACING,
FRONT ROW MOTORSPORTS, INC., and
CURTIS POLK,

Counter-Defendants.

**UNOPPOSED MOTION TO ALTER THE PAGE LIMITS
IN CONNECTION WITH COUNTER-DEFENDANTS' FORTHCOMING
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON THE COUNTERCLAIM**

Counter-Defendants 2311 Racing, LLC d/b/a 23XI Racing, Front Row Motorports, Inc., and Curtis Polk move this Court to alter the page limits in connection with Counter-Defendants' forthcoming motion for summary judgment on the counterclaim. Counter-Defendants request that they be permitted to file an omnibus, 35-page brief in support of the motion to raise summary judgment arguments on behalf of the three Counter-Defendants, with 35 pages for Counter-Plaintiff's omnibus opposition and 17 pages for Counter-Defendants' omnibus reply.

In support of this motion, the Counter-Defendants state as follows:

1. Counter-Defendants intend to move for summary judgment on the counterclaim on or about September 12, 2025.

2. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(d), each Counter-Defendant is entitled to file a separate motion, along with a separate supporting brief of up to 25 pages, and Counter-Plaintiff would likewise be entitled to file three separate opposition briefs of up to 25 pages each. Pursuant to the Pretrial Order and Case Management Plan (Dkt. 84, ¶ I.I.E.), Counter-Defendants would then be entitled to file three separate reply briefs of up to 12 pages each.

3. Rather than burdening the Court with three separate motions, and briefs totaling almost 200 pages, the Counter-Defendants propose the following:

a. Counter-Defendants shall be permitted to file a supporting omnibus brief of up to 35 pages;

b. Counter-Plaintiff shall be permitted to file an omnibus opposition brief of up to 35 pages; and

c. Counter-Defendants shall be permitted to file an omnibus reply brief of up to 17 pages.

4. Counter-Plaintiffs consent to Counter-Defendants' filing of a joint omnibus motion for summary judgment supported by a single omnibus brief, to which it will file a single opposition and Counterclaim-Defendants may file a single reply. Counter-Plaintiff has indicated it takes no position on whether additional pages should be granted if Counter-Plaintiff is afforded the same number of pages.

5. Good cause exists for the requested relief because it will avoid a waste of judicial and party resources.

WHEREFORE, Counter-Defendants jointly move that the page limits set forth in Local Rule 7.1(d) and the Pretrial Order and Case Management Plan be altered as requested herein.

Dated: September 10, 2025

By: /s/ E. Danielle Williams
Jeffrey L. Kessler*
Neha Vyas*
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Tel: (212) 294-6700
Fax: (212) 294-4700
jkessler@winston.com
nvyas@winston.com

Jeanifer E. Parsigian*
Michael Toomey*
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
101 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: (415) 591-1000
Fax: (415) 591-1400
jparsigian@winston.com
mtoomey@winston.com

E. Danielle T. Williams (N.C. Bar No. 23283)
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
300 South Tryon Street
16th Floor
Charlotte, NC 28202
Tel: (704) 350-7700
Fax: (704) 350-7800
dwilliams@winston.com

Matthew R. DalSanto*
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601
Tel: (312) 558-5600
Fax: (312) 558-5700
mdalsanto@winston.com

Josh Hafenbrack*
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1901 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 282-5000
Fax: (202) 282-5100
jhafenbrack@winston.com

Benjamin Gordon*
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
333 S. Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel: (213) 615-1700
Fax: (213) 615-1750
bgordon@winston.com

*Admitted *pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim
Defendants*

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the following:

1. No artificial intelligence was employed in doing the research for the preparation of this document, with the exception of such artificial intelligence embedded in the standard online legal research sources Westlaw, Lexis, FastCase, and Bloomberg;

2. Every statement and every citation to an authority contained in this document has been checked by an attorney in this case and/or a paralegal working at his/her direction as to the accuracy of the proposition for which it is offered, and the citation to authority provided.

This 10th day of September 2025.

/s/ Danielle Williams